DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 305 SP 033 101

AUTHOR Frazier, Calvin; Callan, Patrick
TITLE What State Leaders Can Do To Help Change Teacher Education. Advancing the Agenda for Teacher Education in a Democracy: A Guide for State Leaders.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.; Washington Univ., Seattle. Center for Educational Renewal.
SPONS AGENCY EXXON Education Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., Houston, TX.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-89333-075-2
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 27p.; One of four guides which accompany "Teachers for Our Nation's School" by John I. Goodlad (ED 330 655); for related documents see SP 033 098-101.
AVAILABLE FROM AACTE Publications, One Dupont Circle NW, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036-2412 ($5.00).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; *Educational Change; Educational Finance; *Educational Principles; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *State Action; *State Boards of Education; *State Standards
IDENTIFIERS *Goodlad (John I); Professional Development Schools

ABSTRACT

Changing the conditions under which teachers are prepared is a necessary condition for changing schools. This policy guide emphasizes the role of the state in providing an environment for change. The guide particularly discusses the state's use of incentives and sanctions to raise the visibility and urgency of teacher education reform to the highest levels in colleges and universities. The discussion of what state policymakers can do to help reform teacher education is organized around five major topics: (1) beliefs undergirding the policy recommendations; (2) implications of "restructuring" teacher education; (3) leveraging change in teacher education; (4) state oversight as a force for change; and (5) the cost of change in teacher education. Specific recommendations include establishing clinical schools, eliminating the practice of granting emergency teaching certificates, and terminating teacher education programs that are unable or unwilling to meet program standards established by the state. (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

WHAT STATE LEADERS CAN DO TO HELP CHANGE TEACHER EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ADVANCING THE AGENDA FOR TEACHER EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRACY: A GUIDE FOR STATE LEADERS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David Imig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WHAT STATE LEADERS CAN DO TO HELP CHANGE TEACHER EDUCATION

by Calvin Frazier, University of Denver, Colorado
and Patrick Callan, Education Commission of the States

ADVANCING THE AGENDA FOR TEACHER EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRACY:

A GUIDE FOR STATE LEADERS

The issuance of John I. Goodlad's book, *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*, is a milestone in the continuing dialogue on reform in teacher education. Accompanying this volume are four guides to illustrate specific actions for renewing the education of educators simultaneously with reforming the nation's schools. The guides grew out of a project, Advancing the Agenda for Teacher Education in a Democracy, sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Center for Educational Renewal at the University of Washington, and the Education Commission of the States. The production and printing of the guides in this series were underwritten by grants from the Exxon Education Foundation and Southwestern Bell Foundation. The four guides are as follows:

- *What Business Leaders Can Do To Help Change Teacher Education*
- *What College and University Leaders Can Do To Help Change Teacher Education*
- *What School Leaders Can Do To Help Change Teacher Education*
- *What State Leaders Can Do To Help Change Teacher Education*

These foundations and others have provided substantial support for Dr. Goodlad's effort. In 1990, the Exxon Education Foundation alone contributed $ 1.125 million in grants toward the Education of Educators Project.

The opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this guide do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education or the other groups listed above. The AACTE does not endorse or warrant this information. The AACTE is publishing this document to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation among educators. The authors were encouraged to express their judgment freely. The reader must evaluate this information in light of the unique circumstances of any particular situation and must determine independently the applicability of this information thereto.

Copies of the guides in the series, *Advancing the Agenda for Teacher Education in a Democracy*, may be ordered from:
AACTE Publications
One Dupont Circle NW, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-2412
Single copy (prepaid) $5.00

Published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Printed in the United States of America
International Standard Book Number: ISBN 0-89333-075-2

ADVANCING THE AGENDA FOR TEACHER EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRACY

Ideally, America's elementary and secondary schools should assure that all of the nation's young people will learn to think clearly and critically, live honorably and productively, and function effectively in a social and political democracy. In reality, the schools fall short of the mark.

Many people are raising substantial questions about America's schools, and reform is much on their minds and in the news. But they must realize that the schools will not change until teacher preparation programs change.

Long-term school reform depends on having all teachers in a school working together, constantly reviewing and improving the whole. Because of the way they are prepared, most teachers lack systematic training in consensus building or experience in working as a group with administrators and parents to improve the overall school. Preparation programs focus on work in individual classrooms, not on school reform. Yet, school reform is in trouble if teachers do not learn to see beyond the limited horizon of the classroom.

If schools are to achieve their promise as institutions of a democracy, they must be staffed by teachers who are well-educated, who clearly understand their moral and ethical obligations as teachers in a democratic society, who have a solid grounding in the art and science of teaching, and who take seriously their responsibilities as stewards of the schools. If schools are to have such teachers, then teacher education must undergo serious renewal in tandem with the reform of public schools.

The nation is at a critical juncture, with a rare opportunity at hand. During this decade, many teachers will retire or switch careers. Schools will hire two million new

teachers to fill these vacancies. How they are selected, prepared, and inducted into teaching will be crucial to the success of school reform. Likewise, many professors in both liberal arts and education will retire. Colleges and universities also can further school reform by appointing faculty who will work toward teacher education renewal.

Reforming schools and reforming teacher education must proceed simultaneously. One cannot have good schools without good teachers. Conversely, teachers must learn how to teach in good schools. At present, neither the schools nor the teacher education programs are good enough.

TEACHERS FOR OUR NATION'S SCHOOLS

A blueprint for the simultaneous renewal of schools and the education of educators is put forth in John I. Goodlad's latest book, *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools**. Using surveys, interviews, and visits to representative colleges and universities with teacher education programs, Goodlad and his colleagues have gathered a formidable amount of data on the teacher education enterprise. *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools* presents Goodlad's conclusions and summarizes the richness and depth of this five-year study, the largest ever on the subject.

Goodlad raises serious concerns about

- the nation's changing demographic and economic conditions that are creating new expectations for teachers and schools in a democracy,
- the inadequate way teachers are being prepared,
- the neglect teacher education suffers, and
- the state's tendency to overregulate this professional preparation program.

This policy guide was prepared to help action-oriented state leaders implement the recommendations emerging from Goodlad's study. Because the study focused on colleges and universities, teacher education programs, and schools, Goodlad's book is less explicit than this guide in suggesting specific policy tools available to state leaders. The guide addresses the following questions to help begin the conversation in each state about teacher education renewal:

- How can a state policymaker (governor, legislator, chief state school officer, state higher education executive officer, state board of education member, statewide governing

---

* Goodlad, John I. 1990. *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

or coordinating board member, etc.) determine the relevance of the Goodlad study, critique state policies affecting teacher education programs, and make recommendations to his or her state?

- What questions might help cut through the inevitable assurances that "this state (this institution) has already taken all the steps necessary to reform teacher education"?
- What approaches might help get beyond the current cynicism about the possibility of change, which has developed among state leaders because of higher education's feeble response to the calls for reform of teacher education in the 1980s?
- How can state leaders stimulate reform and renewal of teacher education?

Goodlad's landmark study suggests that state actions to date have not succeeded in stimulating reform of teacher education. (You may think your state has "solved" the teacher education problem; but in most cases, such thinking could be a serious misjudgment.) Among his findings, many of which will concern state policymakers, the following are particularly important:

- Schools and teachers are not prepared to teach students about their responsibilities for democratic values and institutions.
- The leaders of most colleges and universities demonstrate little commitment to the preparation of teachers.
- In most colleges, no identifiable group of faculty has been vested with overall responsibility, authority, and resources for the education of teachers.
- Teacher education programs lack systematic connections with schools.
- The undergraduate curriculum required of prospective teachers lacks cohesiveness and rigor.

- Many of the reforms adopted in the last decade fail to address these systemic problems.
- States often succumb to the temptation to certify unqualified teachers in times of personnel shortages.

It follows from these findings that many new teachers enter their first jobs unable to contribute to the reform efforts being undertaken in their schools. In schools where restructuring is occurring, this means a great waste of energy and resources, as local districts must provide further preparation to these beginners to help them become contributors to the change process. Teacher education programs thus represent an enormous investment on the part of states and institutions of higher education in keeping the schools the way they have always been.

A related problem concerns conditions in the schools. Even if future teachers were to learn effective teaching strategies in their teacher education programs, they often would find their innovative ideas stifled by tradition-bound colleagues in the schools and by system regulations. This problem, coupled with the above, illustrates Goodlad's point that teacher education reform must occur simultaneously with school reform.

THE TASK AHEAD

Despite many of the achievements of the current school reform movement, schooling in America is still in serious trouble. Goodlad's recommendations in *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools* offer hope. By linking school reform with reform of teacher education, the chances are substantially increased for lasting improvements in schooling.

Creating the kinds of schools the nation needs and educating the kinds of teachers those schools need mean concentrated, serious work for at least the next two decades. Part of the effort must take into account the changing demographics of the student population and the changing social context of schooling. The successful simultaneous reconstruction of teacher education and the schools will require diligence, careful management, resources, and patience. An even more important requirement will be the ability and willingness to think clearly and stay the course.

WHAT SCHOOL LEADERS CAN DO TO HELP

We begin this section with the goal we seek to achieve by highlighting the shortcomings of current teacher education programs:

> Each state must have policies that stimulate teacher-preparing institutions to produce graduates who are able to contribute to the restructuring of America's schools and to do this in close collaboration with elementary and secondary schools.

To achieve this goal, state policies must change. Every year, 150,000 to 200,000 new teachers enter the nation's work force. They come from a higher education system that often gives only minimal support to their preparation. They come from a system that rewards research and scholarly writing but provides few tangible rewards for outstanding teaching—and fewer still to faculty who work with the public schools and teachers to support reform efforts. Someone once said if doctors were prepared as teachers, blood-letting might still be used as a primary medical treatment.

Beliefs Undergirding the Policy Recommendations

Before looking at specific policy suggestions, the following basic beliefs need to be considered.

- **If state policymakers fail to provide the initiative and a set of general directions, little will come from reports like the Goodlad study.** If left to their own, institutions—colleges, universities, public schools—will undertake only small incremental change. Major restructuring approaches are given little consideration. Some kind of outside stimulus is necessary, or organizations tend to remain status quo.

• **States seeking to manage institutional change through detailed legislation and regulatory control are doomed to be disappointed with the results.** State leaders cannot run institutions from a distance. Relying on extensive rules and regulations kills the system and reduces the chances for creativity, ownership of the problem, and pride in the goals accomplished. In addition, micromanagement at the state level makes it virtually impossible to hold institutions accountable for results. This is not to deny the state's role: States must ensure that institutions focus on key problems and become more self-regulating and accountable for their outcomes.

• **Institutions of higher education and the public schools must work together to achieve long-term change and the restructuring necessary to turn education around.** Although the President and 50 governors met in Virginia to commit this nation to six significant goals for education to achieve by the year 2000, much of higher education remains aloof from this mission. State leaders must enlist higher education's participation, or abandon college- and university-based teacher education programs as the primary route to certification and public school teaching. Such institutional involvement and commitment probably will not occur without a push from the state.

• **State leadership is a necessary condition for real reform.** This belief needs no explanation.

'Restructuring' Implies a Major Shift

> Proposals for educational reform usually proceed from the assumption that the train is on the tracks and just needs to go faster, more smoothly, or to new destinations...the teacher education train is *not* on the tracks.
>
> John I. Goodlad, *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*

As Goodlad suggests, efforts to improve teacher education to date fall short of the restructuring necessary to put the teacher education train back on track. For example, some states have revised standards for certification and endorsement and reduced detailed and overly prescriptive requirements. In some, the higher education board has looked at teacher education programs for duplication and adequacy in terms of supply and demand. And in some, legislative requirements for a fifth year or master's degree have provided more time for strengthening teachers' general education and preparation in their major fields. These efforts are not to be minimized, but they are not enough to restructure the system. States must go further.

A brief word about the term *restructure*. Teacher education improvements can involve restructuring but most do not. Changes undertaken tend to maintain most of the current practices. Courses may be added. Flexibility may be allowed with waivers or reduced regulatory control. But deep-seated change of the nature suggested by the Goodlad study is avoided. Forces for the status quo are strong.

Restructuring involves major shifts in the use of resources, time, and staff. It means new roles and responsibilities for those engaged in preparing teachers. It may require new organizational structures. However, restructuring teacher education is not high on the priority list of most college and university presidents. And the topic rarely appears on the agenda of university regents or trustees.

Leveraging Change in Teacher Education

In most states, the pressure to reform education is focused on elementary and secondary levels, not higher education. From this observation and Goodlad's study come the following recommendations.

- **Comprehensive, systematic reform of teacher education must be an integral part of state policies to restructure public elementary and secondary education.** State leaders must initiate and encourage institutional reviews with respect to Goodlad's study. Presidents

and governing boards should present their analyses to the legislature and appropriate state agencies. State leaders must be wary that some will respond to Goodlad's study with the all-too-common reactions: "These findings may be true elsewhere, but we're already doing these things." Or, "We have tried these approaches, and they don't work." Many institutional leaders, however, will take the charge seriously and will be thoughtful in their responses.

Local school districts, particularly those likely to engage in providing clinical sites called for in Goodlad's study, must be participants in development of the change proposals. It is important to insist on this collaboration from the outset, if one of Goodlad's major recommendations is to be achieved. Specifically, he insists that prospective teachers participate in a wide variety of clinical experiences—observation, student teaching, internships, and residencies—that take place in exemplary schools (often called clinical or professional development schools). He stresses that the number of students accepted into a teacher education program must not exceed the space available for clinical experiences. And he believes that faculty in both the college and the school must work together to provide the supervision and experiences that future teachers need.

Carefully selected from the public schools near the college or university, professional development schools demonstrate the characteristics of continuous renewal. Their selection as clinical sites for teacher preparation must not be superficial nor left to chance, as so often occurs today. States have a clear-cut role in making sure that clinical schools and their teachers are adequately funded.

- **The responsible state agency must be authorized to terminate teacher education programs that are unable or unwilling to meet program standards established by the state to be essential to the preparation of teachers. Governors and legislators must see that this authority is in place and is exercised when appropriate.** Most states have provisions to terminate teacher education programs that do not meet standards, but the power is rarely used. If states expect changes in the manner consistent with Goodlad's study, they may find some institutions hard pressed to incorporate such reform. State leaders must be willing to

terminate programs judged inadequate and to reallocate financial resources to institutions with effective programs.

Termination—even the threat of losing accreditation—is viewed as a serious public relations problem to most colleges and universities. States thus far have been reluctant to exert such pressure because violations can be so technical in nature as to lack ready understanding by the public. This practice can no longer be tolerated.

• **States must adopt an assessment program for evaluating potential teachers completing preparation programs and requesting state certification.** An effective assessment program encompasses a variety of monitoring techniques and evaluations at different times, not merely a paper-and-pencil test of students' knowledge at the end of the teacher education program. New assessment tools are being developed and used throughout education, and states have an obligation to develop a well-balanced program to assess the outcomes of the teacher education program.

Institutions may argue that follow-up studies of graduates are routinely conducted. As constructed at present, such studies are inadequate. A much more sophisticated, ongoing effort is needed to ascertain new teachers' competence and growth in such skills as critical thinking, individual and group diagnosis, and program evaluation of a class or a school.

• **State funding practices represent powerful incentives and disincentives for institutional change.** Although reluctant to use their appropriation powers to reward or penalize institutions, states are beginning to recognize that the power of the purse can motivate institutions to change. Some institutions will move aggressively to implement far-reaching reforms in teacher education, while others will fail to respond (or their response will be nothing more than rhetoric). Funding practices that give equal support to these institutions send the message to college and university leaders that teacher education is not a priority of the state.

One type of financial incentive that states should consider would reward institutions that successfully enroll and graduate minority students in baccalaureate and teacher education programs. Given the importance of having better teachers for the public schools and the slow progress institutions of higher education and public schools have made in improving minority participation and achievement, funding variations should be considered to encourage sustained attention to these areas.

• **States should establish a minimal statutory framework for the direction of teacher education programs.** State laws governing teacher education must be kept to a minimum. For flexibility, specifics regarding the program review process and program requirements must be kept outside state statutes. In addition, regulatory agencies must keep rules to a minimum and attend to assessing program outcomes rather than to setting specific course requirements and other prescriptive regulations.

Statutory provision should be made granting the state board of education or appropriate agency authority to waive rules and regulations. Such waivers would be granted to institutions proposing creative alternatives and offering a means of testing changes for potential use throughout the system.

Essentially this recommendation and some of the others suggest the need to find ways to stimulate the system without seeking to control it to the point of uniformity. Placing a greater focus on the outcomes of programs can, in itself, give those programs on the cutting edge the latitude needed to pilot systemic change. A focus on outcomes can also create the conditions necessary for institutional accountability.

• **States must eliminate the practice of granting emergency certificates.** Granting emergency certificates undermines entry to public school teaching through teacher education programs of the caliber Goodlad proposes. On the other hand, eliminating emergency certificates does not mean automatically rejecting all innovative routes to certification. As

long as the same outcome expectations are maintained for all approaches, alternative preparation may be a viable option for some states. In a compulsory education system, the state has a special obligation to protect against staffing schools with unqualified teachers.

State Oversight as a Force for Change

The critical element of quality control regarding public school teaching in many, if not most, states is the state's approval of the college or university teacher education program. The state approves the programs, and new teachers applying to the state for licensure are recommended by the preparing institution. States may also choose to assess the candidate in areas of basic skills, subject matter knowledge, or teaching performance. In most states, the state department of education handles these oversight functions.

Although the Goodlad study did not deal explicitly with state oversight patterns, the findings suggest the program approval system that states are using may be ineffective. The review processes can be more demanding, expecially with respect to faculty involvement in teacher education and school-university partnerships. But this has not happened. The department of education and the state board of education have failed often to use program approval as leverage for reform.

- **The state oversight process for teacher education programs must have integrity and credibility.** The practice of relying heavily on accreditation teams of representatives from teacher education programs and other professional educators appears to dilute the process of state approval. The teams, however constituted, must be prepared to rigorously evaluate the institution on its efforts to meet state standards. If these teams cannot assure the state of an exacting and credible assessment, an approach similar to a legislative audit process should be considered.

• **The state review process must include close monitoring of school-university partnership arrangements.** The various teacher education institutions in a state and the local school districts engaged in teacher education must formally enter into a partnership or contract arrangement for the selection of the schools and teachers to work with the teacher education program. This suggests adoption of a school and teacher selection process to be used statewide. It also means school district participation and resource commitment, and state financial support. Identifying exemplary public schools and mentor teachers may have to be achieved in a planned phase-in over a multiyear period.

• **The state oversight process must confirm that regular faculty in the university's program for teachers participate in the school-based field experiences for prospective teachers.** The intent of this recommendation should be clear: Campus instruction should relate directly to field experiences. Faculty and students must engage in inquiry and discussion of actual school situations and with involved school personnel when possible.

• **The state board of education and the higher education commission must work together to encourage and evaluate institutional commitment.** Institutional boards, regents, and trustees must recognize the need for teacher education and commit the necessary resources to its support. Institutions reward faculty for participation in valued activities, and faculty reward systems are quite reliable indicators of institutional commitment. At present, particularly in state universities that place great emphasis on research and publication, faculty members who choose to engage in clinical work with prospective teachers and public schools do so at the risk of being penalized by tenure and promotion practices.

Implementing this recommendation will not be easy. In the end, however, the state's need for faculty involvement in the schools must prevail. If a university cannot provide a reward system to recognize the importance of teacher education as scholarly activity, its teacher education program should be terminated.

• **External reviews should be mechanisms for stimulating programs to become more self-correcting and responsible.** External reviews by state teams, regional accreditation associations, or the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education are important but must not become a substitute for internal assessment of a teacher education program's effectiveness. Ongoing internal processes for evaluation and planning should be in place and drive internal program change. In this area, institutions should model their expectations for teachers and schools.

• **The state oversight process must confirm that a clearly identifiable faculty (e.g., Center of Pedagogy) and administrative leader (e.g., Vice President for Teacher Education) have been given authority and responsibility for all aspects of the teacher education program, including admissions, curriculum, and clinical practice.** Institutions will indicate that the dean of the college or school of education is the authorized administrative leader of teacher education. Goodlad's findings, however, indicate that the dean's power is limited to the faculty of the school or college of education. His findings also make it clear that faculty members in arts and sciences are more critical with respect to subject matter preparation than are faculty in education. Planning for teacher education must be accomplished by a leader and faculty who exercise responsibility for the entire curriculum, including academic and clinical components, and who have sufficient authority and resources to be accountable for outcomes. Faculty should be drawn from education, arts and sciences, and the public schools. With respect to the clinical component, the role of public schools and school district personnel is central.

• **The state board of education and the state higher education board or commission should meet together at least once a year to review and report on the status of teacher education, its quality, and progress toward implementing reforms.** It is an uncommon event in many states for the board of education and the higher education

commission to meet on a regular basis. Yet, if colleges and universities are to develop sustained, systematic relationships with local school districts, it seems reasonable to expect state-level boards responsible for policy to develop similar relationships. These boards can provide models of cooperation in the interest of improving quality at all levels of education. And these two boards must assume responsibility for stimulating and encouraging comprehensive educational reform.

The Cost of Change in Teacher Education

The choice is clear: States can continue to fund a system that falls short of providing the quality of teachers needed for improving public schools, or states can reallocate existing monies, add new monies where needed, and insist that teacher education programs be made more effective and supportive of needed changes in the educational system. Goodlad's findings suggest the current pattern of teacher education found in most institutions is not cost effective in supporting the reform of elementary and secondary education.

What are the costs? In most states these appear to fall into three general areas: clinical schools, college and university transition costs, and program evaluation.

First and most significant will be the creation of exemplary clinical or professional development schools for use in teacher education programs. Some appropriation to the public schools selected as clinical schools is justified, as these schools will become extensions of campus teacher education programs. Because most states have not required field experiences involving mentor teachers in approved schools, this will represent a new expenditure. Additional reimbursement also should be provided to the mentor teachers, depending on increased expectations and time involved in working with the teacher education program.

Second, some colleges and universities will require additional monies to cover transition costs. Installing the new programs will be labor intensive and demanding of faculty time. During the transition period, states should consider augmenting appropriations to

colleges and universities that agree to undertake systematic reform of teacher education along the lines Goodlad proposes. The new programs also will require some reallocation of monies and of faculty time. Because faculty will be expected to become more involved with their students in school-site activities, additional personnel may be needed. This may be achieved, however, by redirecting faculty time from other campus responsibilities.

Third, the state will need to increase its allocation to teacher education program evaluation. In the past, the program review or accreditation team has comprised the primary, and in some cases the only consistent form of, evaluation undertaken in teacher education. We are suggesting that states identify the changes and outcomes they seek in restructured programs and assess the changes achieved in a much more thorough manner. In addition to assessing the skills and insights of new teachers, for example, investigators might also assess the students of first-year teachers who completed restructured programs. High-quality research of the kind needed will require new monies, as historically states have not made such investments.

The reforms advocated by Goodlad and this policy guide will not be achieved on the cheap. As noted, some new monies will be necessary for teacher education reform. These funds will help achieve the nation's comprehensive plan for reforming elementary and secondary education. Since implementation of the needed changes in teacher education will take from three to five years, it will be possible for states to phase in the additional expenditures. New money should be carefully targeted and used where it will provide incentives to reallocate existing resources.

Most of the money for reform is already in the system. The states, the colleges and universities, and the schools must all recognize that most of the money for reform is currently supporting the *status quo*. The key to a state's financial strategy will be to find ways to leverage these dollars.

CHANGE THAT MAKES A DIFFERENCE

Goodlad's most compelling and essential point for policymakers is that the nation has little prospect of achieving substantial improvement in its schools without fundamental changes in the education of teachers. Yet, of all the reform ideas that emerged and were debated in the 1980s, reform of teacher education was overlooked. Goodlad's research and recommendations offer states, colleges and universities, and schools a fresh opportunity and challenge to rethink teacher education on a deeper level and as part of a larger strategy of school restructuring in the 1990s.

The most elemental problems of public schools stem from how schools operate, the structure of the curriculum, the organization and teaching of courses, and the absence of teachers individually and collectively inquiring on a systematic basis about new and better ways of doing things. Teacher education reform would contribute to school restructuring by producing teachers who realize

- that schools are near the breaking point,
- that the quality of a school is closely related to the health and well-being of the community it serves,
- what constitutes a healthy school,
- the importance of working with other teachers, the principal, parents, students, and the community at large to continuously evaluate the school and improve its effectiveness, and
- that all children can learn, and through a variety of strategies they can become excited about learning.

These insights and the skills to implement them must be developed and confirmed in the teacher education program. This professional knowledge base must be undergirded by

a general education that ensures teachers are well educated and can participate effectively in the human conversation.

This policy guide has emphasized the role of the state in providing an environment for change. Particularly, the state's use of incentives and sanctions will raise the visibility and urgency of teacher education reform to the highest levels in colleges and universities—governing boards, presidents, chancellors, and academic officers.

Higher education monopolizes many of the intellectual and credentialling resources that society has available for the reform of public education. Yet, as Goodlad points out, the modern history of American higher education is that of scrambling for the status conferred primarily by research and publication. Along the way, commitments to teaching, in general, and to teacher education and the public schools, in particular, have eroded. It is time to correct this imbalance.

Changing the conditions under which teachers are prepared is a necessary condition for changing schools. Goodlad's study shows that an institutional sloppiness has led to the erosion of quality in teacher education programs. Targeted state intervention is needed to halt that downward trend.

As a first step, we suggest that state policy leaders convene all the stakeholders in teacher education—state officials, leaders of higher education, representatives of the schools, the business community—to assess the condition of teacher education in light of Goodlad's book, this guide, and the other policy guides in this series. This session could be the initial step in developing a state action plan for teacher education reform linked to school reform.

Whatever process states use, the sustained involvement of governors, legislators, and state education officials is essential to reform. However, as Goodlad's research suggests, state leaders must take action toward divesting themselves of micromanagement functions and committing themselves to the tasks of identifying and assessing outcomes and making programmatic decisions based upon outcomes.

While no one strategy will work for all states or for all teacher education programs, no strategy will work without the commitment and involvement of the highest level of leadership in state government, schools, and colleges and universities. No one is in a position to achieve reform unilaterally. Ultimately, most of the real reform must be the responsibility of higher education and public school faculties. As with so many of the challenges confronting society, the nation will look to its political and institutional leaders to identify needs; to stimulate, nurture, and sustain reform; to protect the agents of change; and to hold others and themselves accountable for results.

RESOURCES

For more information on the education of educators and what state leaders can do, please contact:

Mr. Roger Soder, Associate Director, Center for Educational Renewal, College of Education, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, 206/543-6162.

Dr. Joni Finney, Director of Policy Studies, Education Commission of the States, 707 17th St., Suite 2700, Denver, CO 80202-3427, 303/299-3354.

Dr. David G. Imig, Executive Director, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle NW, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036- 2412, 202/293-2450.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In a formal critique process of an early draft of this guide, the following reviewers urged us to be tough, particularly with respect to emergency certification: Donald Bemis, Michigan superintendent of public instruction; Arliss L. Roaden, executive director of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission; Oklahoma State Senator Penny Williams; Peter Ewell, senior associate of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems; and Richard C. Richardson Jr., associate director of the National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance. We hope we have fulfilled their request. Special thanks to John I. Goodlad of the Center for Educational Renewal and Marla Ucelli, senior consultant for education at the Rockfeller Foundation, for their insight and helpful comments as we prepared the manuscript.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL RENEWAL

College of Education
University of Washington